IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA

	COMPLAINT	
POLK COUNTY TENNESSEE ELECTION COMMISSION, Defendant.	: : :	Jury Demand
v.	:	Judge
Plaintiff,	: :	Case No

Comes now, Plaintiff, Melitte Harrison, by and through Counsel, and sues the Defendant, Polk County Election Commission, ("Election Commission") and for her cause of action, states:

I. Jurisdiction

- **1.** Jurisdiction is invoked for violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 *U.S.C.* § 2000e, *et seq.* and the Tennessee Human Rights Act, *T.C.A.* § 4-21-101, *et. seq.*
- **2.** Plaintiff, Melitte Harrison was at all times material herein, a female and a citizen and resident of Polk County, Tennessee.
- **3.** Defendant, Polk County Election Commission is a governmental entity and is a political subdivision of the State of Tennessee. Defendant is responsible for the operations of elections in Polk County, Tennessee.
- **4.** The acts complained of herein occurred in Polk County, Tennessee, where the Plaintiff was assigned as a result of her employment.

Paty, Rymer & Ulin, P.C.

Attorneys at Law 19 Patten Parkway Chattanooga, TN 37402

II. General Allegations

- 5. Plaintiff, Melitte Harrison, was hired by Defendant Polk County Election Commission during April of 2009, as Deputy Registrar of the Polk County Election Commission of Polk County, Tennessee.
- **6.** During November of 2010, Plaintiff was promoted to the position of Registrar or Administrator of Elections.
- 7. During 2010, Plaintiff was involved in three (3) successful elections as either the Deputy Registrar or the Administrator of Elections.
- **8.** During her employment, Plaintiff performed her job duties acceptably within the guidelines established by Defendant and generally applicable to its employees. Plaintiff's performance during her employment was objectively successful and she was never subjected to discipline.
- **9.** During her employment Defendant's commissioners (management) made email communications evidencing a bias against females and an intent to replace Plaintiff with a male employee.
 - **10.** In April of 2011, Plaintiff was terminated from her employment.
- 11. Plaintiff was replaced by a male employee, Mr. Steve Gaddis. Mr. Gaddis had previously been terminated from the Election Commission for poor performance.
- **12.** Ms. Gaddis was less qualified for the position than Plaintiff, and was placed into the position because he was a male.

III. Cause of Action

13. Plaintiff charges and alleges that because of the sex or gender based discrimination to which she was subjected, Defendant is guilty of violations of Title VII of the

Paty, Rymer & Ulin, P.C.

Attorneys at Law 19 Patten Parkway Chattanooga, TN 37402 Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq.

14. Plaintiff charges and alleges that because of the sex or gender based discrimination to which she was subjected, Defendant is guilty of violations of the Tennessee Human Rights Act, *T.C.A.* § 4-21-101, *et. seq.*

IV. Damages

15. As a direct and proximate result of the acts and omissions of the Defendant, Plaintiff has suffered lost wages, mental pain and suffering, embarrassment, humiliation and general damages.

V. Relief Sought Against Defendant

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, prays that proper process issue and be served upon the Defendant in this action in the manner prescribed by law; and

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendant for compensatory damages, reasonable attorney fees and all costs; and

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands a jury to try all issues, when joined.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

PATY, RYMER & ULIN, P.C.

By:

BPR #18760

Attorneys for Plaintiff

19 Patten Parkway

Chattanooga, TN 37402

R-Larramore@PRandUlaw.com

(423) 756-6770

Paty, Rymer & Ulin, P.C. Attorneys at Law 19 Patten Parkway Chattanooga, TN 37402